

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 26, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants appreciate the indication by the Examiner that claims 11, 12, 15-17, 19-29, and 31-42 are allowed.

Claims 1-9 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1 and 8 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-9, 11-12, 15-17, 19-29 and 31-42 remain pending in this application.

With respect to claim 29, claim 29 is indicated on the form PTOL-326 as being allowed, but is not specifically listed as allowed in the text of the Office Action. Applicants request confirmation that claim 29 is allowed.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Related Art ("ARA") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0018108 to Okumura et al. (hereinafter "Okumura"). Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Applicants submit that claim 1 as amended fully complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and respectfully request that the rejection to claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Okumura is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 recites "an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device" having a combination of features including "a plurality of pixels each including R (Red), G (Green), B (Blue) and W (White) subpixels defined by a plurality of gate lines and a plurality of data lines" and "wherein each W subpixel of adjacent pixels of the plurality of pixels is not adjacent to another W subpixel." Applicants respectfully submit that ARA and Okumura do not teach at least this quoted combination of features.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that ARA does not teach dedicated white pixels, and cites Okumura as teaching that the use of white pixels was conventional. However, the arrangement cited by the Examiner in the Office Action including "the white pixel added immediately after the blue pixel" would not result in "wherein each W subpixel of

adjacent pixels of the plurality of pixels is not adjacent to another W subpixel” as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that ARA and Okumura, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach the combined features of claim 1, and that claim 1, and claims 2-7 depending from claim 1 are each allowable over ARA and Okumura.

Claim 1 further recites “wherein the R, G, B, and W subpixels of each pixel are arranged in a zigzag pattern in a data line direction.” Applicants submit that ARA shows the subpixels of each pixel arranged in a linear arrangement and that Okumura does not cure this additional deficiency in the teachings of ARA. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, and claims 2-7 are allowable over ARA and Okumura for at least this additional reason.

Independent claim 8 recites a having a combination of features including “wherein the R, G, B, and W subpixels of each pixel are arranged in a zigzag pattern in a data line direction, the electrodes of the subpixels having the same color of adjacent pixels being arranged in a different direction to compensate a main viewing angle of each of R, G, B, W subpixels, and the W subpixels being non-linearly arranged along the data line.”

In rejecting claim 8, the Examiner cites ARA as teaching this combination of features except for the W subpixels. Applicants respectfully submit that ARA does not teach at least “the W subpixels being non-linearly arranged along the data line” and that this deficiency in the teachings of ARA is not cured by Okumura. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 and claim 9 depending from claim 8 are each allowable over ARA and Okumura.

Applicants believe the above amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 26, 2007

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 26, 2007

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants